

Application No. 09/894,607  
Amendment "B" dated November 30, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 1, 2005

### REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the recent courtesies extended during the in person interview conducted on October 21, 2005. The amendments and remarks made herein are consistent with the proposals and discussions presented during the interview.

In the last Office Action, mailed September 1, 2005, claims 1-14 and 16-34 were considered and rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Blakely, III et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,067,623), and in further view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,367,009).<sup>1</sup>

By this paper, claims 1, 12 and 24 (the only independent claims at issue) have been amended and new claims 35-37 have been added, such that claims 1-14 and 16-37 now remain pending.<sup>2</sup>

As discussed during the interview, the cited art fails, alone and in combination, to anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention. In particular, Blakely and the other cited art fail to teach, disclose or otherwise suggest a system or method in which a wireless device accesses a domain at a remote content server upon providing authentication credentials comprising both a password and user name for resources at one or more domains, as claimed, wherein a WAP server forwards the authentication credentials on to a gateway, which maps the authentication credentials based on pre-established criteria, and by changing at least one of the domain and user name. This is particularly true when considering that changing the username includes at least one of adding a suffix or prefix to the user name, adding new characters to a middle portion of the user name, replacing a portion of the user name, or deleting some characters from the user name, as recited in the claims. As further recited in the claims, and as further distinguished from the art of record, the mapped authentication credentials are then sent to the network along with the original password that was provided by the wireless client, as claimed.

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status and some of the assertions made with regard to the cited art is not being challenged at this time, inasmuch as it is not necessary following the amendments and remarks made herein, which distinguish the claims from the art of record, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art, as well as any official notice, which was taken in the last office action, at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, such as, for example in a subsequent amendment or during prosecution of a related application. Accordingly, Applicants' decision not to respond to any particular assertions or rejections in this paper should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to said assertions or rejections.

<sup>2</sup> Support for the claim amendments and new claims is found in the disclosure of at least pages 7, 10 and 18-20, as shown during the interview.

Application No. 09/894,607  
Amendment "B" dated November 30, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 1, 2005

It was generally agreed during the interview that it appeared that the cited art of record did not teach or suggest any such method or system, as claimed in the amended claims.<sup>3</sup> In fact, to the contrary, Blakely teaches away from such embodiments in which the user provides the password that is ultimately used to help retrieve or access documents. (Col. 4, ll. 34-36; Col. 5, ll. 12-16, background). Instead, Blakely stores the password at the server so that the user does not have to store or provide it. It also appears that Blakely does not change any domain or provide any means for changing a domain. Instead, it appears as if Blakely only changes a user ID and thereafter obtains the corresponding token/password from storage for the changed ID. (Col. 4, ll. 25-29, 39-41; Col. 5).

The other art of record also fails to teach or suggest the use of a password, as claimed, with a changed domain or user name to access content. In fact, previously cited art, which is not even being used to reject the claims at present, was also discussed and found lacking in this regard during the interview.

Applicants also point out that the cited disclosure in the last action fails to teach or suggest the changing of a domain (claims 2 and 35, for example) or user name in the manner claimed. Instead, it appeared that the Examiner was taking official notice that such elements would be obvious, or that some of the elements would simply be possible, although no official notice was taken. Accordingly, if the Examiner continues to reject the claims, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner show where each and every limitation is taught by the art and the motivation for combining the teachings of the art,<sup>4</sup> including the limitations specifying the various embodiments in which the name/domain changes include adding a suffix or prefix to

<sup>3</sup> This is particularly true when considering embodiments in which the password is entered by the wireless client and wherein different authentication credentials must be provided by the wireless client to access different resources at the content server (claim 37) and when the password is a simple PIN. (claim 36)

<sup>4</sup> Applicants remind the Examiner that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim limitations." MPEP § 2143. Furthermore, the "FACT THAT THE CLAIMED INVENTION IS WITHIN THE CAPABILITIES OF ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART IS NOT SUFFICIENT BY ITSELF TO ESTABLISH *PRIMA FACIE* OBVIOUSNESS." MPEP § 2143.01. This is true even if all of the elements are taught by the cited art, which they aren't in this case. Furthermore, Applicants also point out that with regard to any art that might be combined by the Examiner in any future rejection of this case, that the motivation for making such a combination must come from the references themselves, not the Applicant's own application, otherwise such a combination represents impermissible hindsight. In particular, as stated by the MPEP § 2143, "The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in application's disclosure."

Application No. 09/891,607  
Amendment "II" dated November 30, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 1, 2005

the user name or domain, adding new characters to a middle portion of the user name, replacing a portion of the user name, or deleting some characters from the user name, as recited in the claims.

Finally, with regard to the 112 rejections, based on indefiniteness, Applicants point out that the amendments to claims 12 and 24 have removed the language "relatively", which was objected to, such that the 112 rejections are now moot.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for prompt allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 1 day of December, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:ahm  
TPA0000001758V001